

A CERTIFIED TRUE COPYJUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

APR 17 2007

ATTEST
Kelli
FOR THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATIONC 06-7600 SJ
RELEASED FOR PUBLICATION
M 07-cv-1827 SJ

DOCKET NO. 1827

FILED
APR 17 2007APR 20 2007 FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE
RICHARD W. WIECKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION****IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

BEFORE WM. TERRELL HODGES, CHAIRMAN, D. LOWELL JENSEN, J. FREDERICK MOTZ, ROBERT L. MILLER, JR., * KATHRYN H. VRATIL, DAVID R. HANSEN AND ANTHONY J. SCIRICA, * JUDGES OF THE PANEL

TRANSFER ORDER

This litigation currently consists of twenty actions pending in five separate districts: the Northern District of California (thirteen actions), the District of New Jersey (three actions), the Southern District of New York (two actions), the Eastern District of New York (one action) and the Western District of Tennessee (one action). Plaintiffs in eight of the thirteen Northern District of California actions and plaintiff in one of the three District of New Jersey actions separately move the Panel, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, for centralization of this litigation in their respective districts.¹ All responding parties support centralization. The majority support selection of the Northern District of California as transferee forum, while others urge the Panel to choose the District of New Jersey, the Southern District of New York, or the Western District of Washington.²

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, the Panel finds that these twenty actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization under Section 1407 in the Northern District of California will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. All these actions involve common factual allegations concerning defendants' alleged conspiracy to fix the price of thin film transistor-liquid crystal display (TFT-LCD) panels, which are used in computer monitors, flat panel television sets, and other electronic devices. Centralization under Section 1407 is necessary in order to eliminate duplicative discovery, prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary.

We conclude that the Northern District of California is an appropriate transferee forum in this docket because over 50 of the actions of which the Panel has been notified have been brought in that

* Judge Scirica took no part in the disposition of this matter. In light of the fact that Judge Miller could be a member of the putative class(es) in this litigation, he has filed with the Clerk of the Panel a formal renunciation of any claim that he may have as a putative class member, thereby removing any basis for a disqualification of Judge Miller on that ground.

¹ The Panel has been notified of over 100 additional related actions pending in multiple districts. These actions and any other related actions will be treated as potential tag-along actions. See Rules 7.4 and 7.5, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001).

² Certain other responding parties initially suggested that the Panel select either the Eastern District of Tennessee or the District of South Carolina, but withdrew those suggestions at oral argument.

SCHEDULE A

MDL-1827 -- In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation

Northern District of California

Judd Eliasoph v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7588 S^I
Jo Nash v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7601 S^I
Will Henderson v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7609 S^I
Jamie Maites v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7638 S^I
Henry Truong v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7639 S^I
Crago Corp. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7644 M^{MM} C
Robert Kerson v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7678 S^I
Karen Brock v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7679 S^I
Ari Hakim v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 3:06-7699 S^I
Arthur Sorokin v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 4:06-7600 S^I
Amy Forlan v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 4:06-7602 S^I
Stephanie Truong v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 4:06-7640 S^I
Frederick Rozo v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 4:06-7693 S^I

District of New Jersey

Nathan Muchnick, Inc. v. Sharp Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:06-6107
Roberta Harrell v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 2:06-6190
Richard A. Markham v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 2:06-6191

Eastern District of New York

Chris Ferencsik v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-6714

Southern District of New York

Gladys Baker v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-14335
Jack Elbaz v. LG Philips LCD Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 1:06-14423

Western District of Tennessee

Audio Video Artistry v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 2:06-2848